

The Charlotte Journal.

T. J. HOLT,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

VOLUME XX.

"Perpetual Vigilance is the Price of Liberty," for "Power is always Stealing from the Many to the Few."

CHARLOTTE, N. C. APRIL 17, 1850.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.
AT \$2 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

NUMBER 20.

SPEECH OF
Edward Stanly, of North Carolina,
Delivered in the House of Representatives,
MARCH 6, 1850.

CONTINUED.

But, to another aggression on the South.—In 1843, Massachusetts passed resolutions recommending a change in the Constitution of the United States. The recommendation was, that the third clause of the second section of the first article of the Constitution should be so changed as to abolish the representation of the southern States for their slaves. This proposition was denounced as tending to disunion. A gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Gilmer,) and one from South Carolina, (Mr. Bart,) said of it, "a proposition precisely similar to that now under consideration was made by the notorious Hartford Convention." I think that an amendment is made here will be made, and disunion will be the inevitable consequence.

But though the Legislature of Massachusetts did wrong in this instance, it does not follow that while our present Constitution stands, the would interfere with slavery in the southern States. If it evinces a disposition to interfere, it evinces also the want of power under the Constitution. Our State Legislature's measures do silly things. They resolve the year against the resolve of the year before. But I wish to call the attention of my colleagues, (Mr. Clingman) who no doubt regards these Massachusetts resolutions as an aggression, to some proceedings of the last Legislature of our State. We had before us, in the winter of 1848-49, a proposition to amend our State constitution. In the gubernatorial canvass of 48, an issue was made, upon the propriety of striking out from our State constitution, a provision which requires that all votes for the State shall be given by ballot. The Democrats raised the cry of "free suffrage." The Whig candidate—a most estimable gentleman—was understood to oppose free suffrage; as might have been expected, the Democrats nearly elected their candidate in a State that gave Taylor more than eight thousand majority over Cass. But when the proposition was brought forward to amend our constitution, some of the members from my colleague's (Mr. Clingman's) district were earnest in advocating the "white basis." They probably remember what my colleague said in his speech in December, 1847, of the "white race being superior to the black; of course a country filled with the former is more vigorous and prosperous than one filled with a mixed race."

When the proposition was before the Legislature, other amendments were offered, besides that relating to "free suffrage." That I may be understood, let me state that by our State constitution the House of Commons is composed of members elected from the counties "according to the federal population." The principle seems to have been derived from the Constitution of the U. S., in which Massachusetts wished to amend in 1845 the "third clause of the second section of the first article." One western gentleman proposed in the North Carolina Legislature: "And be it further enacted, That the Constitution be so amended as to provide that the State shall hereafter be apportioned among the several counties of this State according to the Federal basis, and the members of the House of Commons according to the white population of the State."

For this amendment forty one western members voted, Whigs and Democrats, and among them some of the best men in our State.

Another gentleman proposed "that, in all future arrangements of Senatorial districts, the whole number of white population of the State alone shall be divided by fifty, and a very fifth part of the white population alone shall be entitled to a Senator."

Our State senators are elected according to a basis of taxation.

As to the gentleman—a bolder and truer man is rarely to be found—proposed an amendment, that "the members of the House of Commons be apportioned according to the white population of the State." Rejected—yeas 38, nays 66. And then, just as these political movements are made in the southern States, another gentleman from my colleague's district (Mr. Clingman) moved that "the words 'federal population' be struck out of the Constitution, and 'free white population' be inserted in the stead." Rejected—28 to 66.

This last gentleman—a Democrat—thought he would go beyond what the Whig member had proposed. Said these men be called Abolitionists? No, sir, no; they would be the first to take arms, if it were necessary, against them. But in Massachusetts a proposition of the like character is denounced as being "the result of the wicked designs of ambitious agitators and ignorant fanatics." I ask my colleague, (Mr. Clingman) what shall be said of the "white basis" advocates in western North Carolina? Are they agitators? I think the people in eastern North Carolina will ask my colleague to stop agitation at home before he threatens to dissolve the Union for agitation abroad.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the members of our State Legislature who made these propositions are not fanatics. They are true sons of the old North State. They live in the most beautiful land that the sun of heaven ever shone upon. Yes, sir, I have heard the anecdote from Mr. Clay, that a preacher in Kentucky, when he desired to make his audience believe it was a place of bliss, said it was a Kentucky of a place. Sir, this preacher had never visited the western counties of North Carolina. I have spent days of rapture in looking at her

scenery of unsurpassed grandeur, in hearing the roar of her magnificent water-falls, second only to the great cataract of the North; and while I gazed for hours, lost in admiration, at the power of Him who, by his word, created such a country, and gratitude for the blessing he had scattered upon it, I thought that if Adam and Eve, when driven from Paradise, had been near this land, they would have thought themselves in the best place to that they had left. I could but think—I hope reverently—of what was told the children of Israel they should have, when he said—

"For the Lord thy God bringeth thee into a good land—a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills:

"A land of wheat and barley and vines and fig-trees and pomegranates; a land of oil, olive and honey; thou shalt not lack bread without scarceness; thou shalt not lack anything in it; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass."

And to this country, for want of a railroad, he has sent strangers. And now, when our patriotic sons at home, forgetting all party calls, are, with united effort, struggling nobly to build this road, to make us better acquainted, to build up cities in the East, to give our farmers a market for their produce, to stop the tide of emigration, to bind the East and West together in indissoluble bonds of interest and affection, our ears are assailed here with the hoarse howling of disunion! And we are invited to contemplate the glories of a southern confederacy, in which Virginia and South Carolina are to have great cities, to be supported by the colony plantation of North Carolina! A southern confederacy in which the rulers will lead us into an unholy crusade, as far as Vera Cruz, to conquer territory, to give the "sons of the Presidents" a market! When the American army was rejecting the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown; when the acclamation of our revolutionary patriots, their thanks to Providence were poured forth from their grateful hearts, it is said that a Scotchman, whose bullock had been taken to supply the wants of the soldiers, was heard to shout through the army, "Beel! Beel! Beel!" when he was clamoring for the price of his property. The genius of the illustrious Patrick Henry has given this man an unfavorable notoriety. In the minds of the people of North Carolina the name of John Hook will be associated with these advocates of disunion and civil war.

Has the heart of the great mass of our people of both parties are right. Our great railroad must and will be built. In a few years, the everling sound of the steam whistle will be heard in the recesses of our forests; beautiful villages will spring up among us, and the "little hills shall rejoice on every side;" the "valleys shall stand so thick with corn that they shall laugh and sing."

Yes, sir, we will build this road; and with the electro-magnetic telegraph we can communicate news in a few hours to places distant hundreds of miles. And let instruction take place, our gallant mountain boys—and among the first of them, the "white basis" members of our Legislature—will come down by thousands to our aid. They will come "as the winds come when navies are stranded."

But I must hurry on. Inexorable, relentless time will not stay his march, even to hear me speak of the future glories of North Carolina.

I come now to another reason assigned by some why we should think of disunion. It was also referred to in the southern address. It is the "notorious Gott's resolution." Now what is it?

I have a copy before me. In December, 1848, Mr. Gott offered this resolution. It was also referred to in the southern address. It is the "notorious Gott's resolution." Now what is it?

"Resolved, That the Committee for the District of Columbia be instructed to report a bill as soon as practicable prohibiting the slave trade in said District."

The resolution was adopted, afterwards, reconsidered, and no action I believe was ever afterwards had upon it. And here, by the way, I wish I could have some good reason why the southern Democracy voted for the previous question, with the Abolitionists, on this resolution? Why was action desired except for agitation? But this is the Gott Resolution—this is the resolution which roused the South, and brought about the southern convention which issued the southern address. It proposes simply to abolish the slave trade in this District.

If I understand correctly the opinions of Mr. Clay, in his recent and former speeches, he has expressed his willingness that the slave trade in this District should be abolished. But because he was a candidate for the Presidency, he has been called an Abolitionist. But I have strong southern authority to support Gott's resolution. A distinguished Senator from Alabama, one very worthy of the place he adorns, a gentleman of ability, of dignified senatorial deportment, respected by all who know him, and I am proud to say, a native of my own State, (Mr. King,) in a recent debate in the Senate, used very strong language upon this subject. This gentleman had so good a character, that even John Tyler conferred office on him without injuring him. He said, very properly, "he asked no act of Congress to carry slavery any where."

The Senator is opposed to the Wilmot proviso, as I am. And I concur with him entirely in what he says of abolishing slavery in this District. I have an extract from his remarks, which I will print, not having time to read them.

Mr. King, of Alabama, said "that whether

the Congress of the United States has, under the Constitution, the right to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia or not, it would be as gross a violation of good faith towards Maryland and Virginia, as if it had been expressly prohibited in the Constitution, as long as those States remained slaveholding States."

"With regard to what is called the slave trade, I have never seen the day—and Senators are aware of it, I presume, from the course I have pursued heretofore—when I was not willing to pass a law for the purpose of breaking up those miserable establishments that exist under the very eyes of Congress itself, and are so offensive to many gentlemen, who feel perhaps more sensitive on the subject than I do. I am free to say that I am the very last man who would be willing to encourage such establishments."

Did Gott's resolution propose to do any thing else but "break up these miserable establishments?" And yet if this is done, he Nashville Convention will be instructed to prepare for a dissolution of the Union! And a bill was reported from a committee, I learn of the last Congress, of which the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Brown) was a member, to abolish the slave trade in this District. Again I say, sir, that had Gen. Cass been elected President, we should not have heard all this outcry.

Here allow me to say, sir, that no man in his senses believes Congress will ever be guilty either of the outrage or the folly of abolishing slavery in this District; excepting of course those fanatics who think the Constitution is an "agreement with Hell." If any sensible man ever thought of it, I would ask him *what for?* Would it not inevitably lead to the abolition of the slave trade from Massachusetts (Mr. Mann) spoke of? Would it not separate husband and wife, parent and child? Any owner of a slave can take him out of the District when he pleases. And what would be the condition of those free negroes married to slaves? I do not believe we will ever have a President who would approve such a bill. If Mr. Van Buren were President, I would even trust him; and although he had pledged himself not to veto the bill, I believe he would do it.

Such an act would justly be regarded by the Southern States as a declaration of hostility on the part of the North, and they would act accordingly.

[Here Mr. Stanly was rudely interrupted by Mr. Hilliard, of Alabama, which led to controversy between Mr. Hilliard and Mr. Stanly, which is reported at length in the Daily Globe of March 7th, 1850, to which paper Mr. S. specially refers, as other reports have been garbled.]

Mr. Chairman, when I was interrupted by the gentleman from Alabama, I was speaking of the aggression on the South.

Yes, the South has been terribly oppressed! Out of the sixty years since the Constitution was framed, the South has had the Presidents all of the time except twelve years and one month. We have had our share of other high offices. How is it now? In the midst of this formidable invasion of our rights, when the Abolitionists are so strong, we have elected a southern President, who was said to be the owner of more than two hundred slaves! and that, too, against the nominees of the Baltimore convention, when it was said "there was no slaveholder on their ticket!"

We have a southern Speaker, with whose manner of discharging the duties of the chair I have no complaint to make. And what a spectacle is presented! So strong was party feeling with some gentlemen from the non-slaveholding States, that when the issue was a northern or a southern Speaker, they refused to vote for a northern Speaker. This speaks volumes; party feelings must always influence us, must always be felt by the North and West, and southern votes will always be wanted.

A majority of the Cabinet are from slaveholding States. In the Supreme court we have five to four. In the army and navy we have our full share. Of the foreign ministers we have more than our share. But still "Gott's resolution," or some other aggression, troubled us. Let me record another instance of northern liberality. When General Harrison died, Mr. Tyler became President. Mr. Southard, of New Jersey, was chosen President of the Senate; he died, and did the North practice aggression on us? Did they elect a northern President of the Senate? No; they elected a distinguished Senator (Mr. Mangum) from my own State.

Mark, Mr. Chairman, my argument is not to defend the Abolitionists, or agitators, but to prove that the North—the great body of the people—are not enemies to the South. And to pursue this argument, how did the votes stand in the last Presidential election? I have not time to make a very accurate statement, but this statement is nearly correct.

In what are called the free States,
Taylor received 925,646 votes
Cass 812,855
Van Buren 291,678
—2,030,179

In the slaveholding States,
Taylor and Fillmore rec'd 435,378
Cass and Butler 409,436
Van Buren 299
—845,113

Whole number of votes, (excluding South Carolina, whose electors are chosen by her Legislature,) 2,875,292
Majority of Union men over Free-Soilers and Abolitionists, only 2,533,315—more than two millions five hundred thousand!

Taylor's majority, although he was reported to be the owner of two hundred slaves, was

more than one hundred thousand. And this majority in the non-slaveholding States, where he was opposed by Gen. Cass, who is reported to have said he thanked God he never owned a slave—said he never would, and prayed for its abolition?

Is this hostility to the South? No, sir; the true secret is, the spoils are gone; some editors are turned out of office, others are disappointed. Or, to use the words of my colleague, Mr. Clingman, in an extract before me as reported in the Appendix to the Congressional Globe, 28th Congress, 1st session, page 466—he said—the Democratic party what I would say to the dough-faces:

"It will be found on examination this party is governed by seven principles—as John Randolph is reported to have said to Thomas Ritchie—the five leaves and the two fishes. Or, in the language of John C. Calhoun, late a distinguished leader of this party, remarkable for his powers of generalization and condensation, and who was thereby enabled to analyze, simplify, and reduce to a single element these various principles, it is the 'spoils party' held together by the collective power of public plunder."

And here, sir, let me say another word to my colleague, while I think of it.

I hope he will pause in his hasty course until he hears from the people in the eastern part of the State. In case of civil war, they are more likely to be injured by insurrection and foreign foes than my colleague's constituents.

According to the census of 1840, as nearly as I can ascertain, in the district of my colleague, (Mr. Outlaw,) from the north-eastern counties, the population was—

	WHITE.	SLAVE.
Wilmington dist.	42,458	36,053
Washington "	49,486	33,238
Washington "	49,308	37,665

Now, what is the condition among my colleague's 'white basis' constituents?

Bancroft district (Clingman's)—White population, 60,030; Slave population 9,229.

These eastern districts are on the sea coast. My colleague's is the most inaccessible point to a foreign foe in the United States. I do not believe, sir, the good people he represents are willing to eng go to foreign or civil war, for any aggression yet committed; and not even to recover fugitive slaves. And I do not believe my colleague's constituents ever lost a slave by northern Abolitionists. Bad men sometimes steal slaves; if that aggression can be stopped by my colleague, he will do us great service.

I hope to be allowed to speak to my colleague for my constituents—to speak as an eastern man, and as a slaveholder. If, in the providence of God, any calamity befalls us on account of our slaves, I shall be among my people. I shall not enquire, as the servant of my friend of Kentucky (Mr. Marshall) did, when he told his servant John, he wished him to go to Mexico. "Master," said John, after reflection, "how far is the camp from the battle-ground?" His master could not answer satisfactorily, and John declined to go. My affections, my interest, my duty, all bind me with hooks of steel to my home. The graves of my forefathers, for several generations, are there; the dearest friends I have on earth are there; there I expect to live, and there I hope to die; and whatever calamity may come, their fate will be my fate—"thy God will be my God."

I wish now, sir, to say a word to the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Meade), who did me the honor to send me a copy of his speech in the early part of the session.

I protest, as a southern man, against the doctrines of his speech, delivered before the gentleman's constituents in August, 1849. And I think, if copies of it were circulated in New Mexico, and the people understood the gentleman was an influential man at home and in Congress, it would be enough of itself to excite slavery from that Territory.

Mr. Ash. The gentleman to whom you refer is not in the House; he is not in the city; he is sick.

Mr. Stanly. I am sorry to hear of the gentleman's illness; though I shall make no remarks of an offensive character. If I had heard he had been taken sick shortly after the delivery of this speech, I should not have been at a loss to account for his illness. I am obliged to my colleague for the motive which prompts the interruption.

The gentleman (Mr. Meade) says: "We are no propagandists of slavery; had we no slaves, there is not a man present who would vote to bring them among us." I am glad to hear the declaration. The gentleman probably concurs in opinion with my colleague, (Mr. Clingman,) when he said, a country filled with the white race "is more vigorous and prosperous than one filled with a mixed race." My colleague shakes his head; he will find on examination, I am right in stating what he said—a sentiment that will answer better for the hills of Bancroft than for eastern lowlands; for negroes thrive in some parts of our country where white people can hardly live. The bilious fever is sometimes in the lowlands very fatal to the white race. I have heard a highly intelligent gentleman, and a large slaveholder, say he had never known a negro to die from the bilious fever. But I should be glad to be informed, why the gentleman from Virginia would not bring them amongst us, if they "elevate our character"—a sentiment that meets my hearty condemnation. For, if it be true, "the owner of sixty slaves" is more elevated in his character than the owner of five—then he who holds no negroes cannot be elevated in his character! I know a certain district in the United States, in which it was urged that a Democratic candidate, "the

owner of sixty slaves," was more worthy of public confidence than a Whig who did not own a half a dozen; but it was not argued that the large slave owner was more "elevated in character" for that reason.

Again: The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Meade, says:

"The situation of Virginia is more critical than any of her sisters. She has a slave population of near half a million, whose value is chiefly dependent on southern demand."

Now, sir, if I understand this, it means that Virginia slave owners raise negroes to sell. If so, I say it is horrible to think of. I have spent the most of my life among slaveholders—religious men of all denominations are slaveholders—but I do not know one man in my district or my State who raises negroes for "southern demand"—to sell. I should be ashamed to own such a constituency.

Again, says the gentleman from Virginia: "The whole civilized world is now uniting in a crusade against American slavery, even where it now exists."

I do not admit the correctness of this assertion. But if it be true, how, I ask, shall we improve our condition by dissolving the Union? Both the great parties of the country admit their obligation to stand by the Constitution. What will be the crusade when that Constitution is destroyed?

Again, says the gentleman from Virginia:

"While it must be admitted that strong objections may be urged to the institution of slavery, yet there are advantages also, which, in the opinion of many, are full compensation for the evils attending it. Our past history testifies to the fact that it elevates the character of the white man. Though we have been in a numerical minority in the Union for fifty years, yet during the greater part of that period we have managed to control the destinies of this nation."

The gentleman from Indiana, (Mr. Fitch) has already commented on this remark, and I have but one word to add. Are we not now, by our share in the great offices of the Republic, still controlling the destinies of the nation?

But the gentleman says:

"The diffusion of our population is essential to our very existence."

It may be so in Virginia, but it is not so in North Carolina; if we are let alone we can manage ours. Is this diffusion to go on indefinitely? If New Mexico is admitted into the Union, and abolishes slavery, where will the diffusion then be? I see no danger to our existence in the admission of New Mexico as a free State. I had rather have her there than to have a free Mexican State not under the influence of our Constitution and laws.

But in the gentleman's speech he takes another view of the subject. He says:

"If, in the mean time, the Mexican States on the Rio Grande should be annexed, (as they will be if they are to come in as free States,) we shall be entirely cut off from the hope we now have of letting off this population, then probably valueless as property, among a people already, to a certain extent, homogeneous, and with whom they may readily and naturally amalgamate."

Now, sir, this is worse, if possible, than the idea of "southern demand." Here is a bright picture for the citizens of New Mexico! Amalgamate! What will the inheritors of the old Castilian blood and spirit say to that? The gentleman's speech has been extensively circulated. Newspapers have copied large portions of it. Each member of Congress, I learn, has been politely furnished with a copy. If it reaches New Mexico, and her people understand the gentleman's expressions the opinions of the South, he will be entitled to the credit or blame of keeping slaves from New Mexico.

I wish now, sir, to say a word to some of the agitators on this floor, who have been guilty of unkind and cruelly uncharitable speeches. A gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Mann,) who has the reputation of being a man of letters and of cultivated taste, gave utterance to expressions which he must have known were offensive to every southern man in this House. He drew a horrid picture of the probable consequences of disunion. Some expressions are, I think, modified in his printed speech; and my blood ran cold to hear a gentleman of his age and standing apparently delight in wounding our feelings.

I will not repeat the expressions to which I refer. I could not speak of them in respectful terms. Sir, I have no personal acquaintance with the gentleman from Massachusetts. But if he be the man I have heard of as possessing a cultivated mind, adorned with rare classical attainments, if his speech is a fair exhibition of his feelings, I fear he will furnish another melancholy example of the truth of assertion, that a cultivated intellect is not always attended with a cultivated heart; that a man's mind may be "rich with the spoils of time," and his heart of flinty coldness. The gentleman is not unknown to the country as an able and eloquent lecturer to literary institutions. His services in the cause of education have been valuable. He has proved in that offensive speech, that with him "knowledge is a Swiss mercenary, ready to combat either in the works of sin, or under the banner of righteousness;" ready to give wholesome advice to young men when entering upon life, or to fan the flames of fanaticism.

The gentleman seemed to speak without regret at the thought that "domestic fury and fierce civil strife" should reign among us. What reason, or what motive can prompt the gentleman from Massachusetts thus to speak to us? It cannot give him strength at home. No one accuses any northern man of wishing

to establish or extend slavery; and, if the gentleman will withdraw himself from his philosophical reveries, for a few moments, and ask himself, with the remembrance that there is an eye that sees the thoughts of the heart—"What good have I done, what good did I hope to do, by outraging the feelings of any of the members of this House?" I think the "still small voice" will tell him—None, none! I fear the gentleman will prove it is true—

"Heart merit wanting, meant we never sought, Our height is but the gift of our name."

If I might presume to advise one so competent to give advice as the gentleman from Massachusetts is, I would tell him—Better keep at your lectures, have them published and pulled by your friends. In this way, good may be achieved by your efforts—Your eloquence may be praised, extracts may be published from your lectures, exciting the admiration of sophomores and of men. But I beg the gentleman to remember, that, though he speaks with the "tongues of men and of angels, and has not charity," he will become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And another gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Stephens,) in a speech which was, apparently, elaborately prepared, gave utterance to sentiments, clothed in language that a southern gentleman would not use to a respectable negro. I expected some ultraism from this source. That gentleman is known as a man of excessive humanity. And, since anti-slavery will no longer answer for a hobby horse, since Morgan's mysterious disappearance has ceased to agitate the public mind in the North, the gentleman must preach against the horrors and the despotism of slavery. I hope his next speech will fit to be read in the families of Pennsylvania farmers. I hope the gentleman will find some other Morgan to frighten the grandmothers and children of Pennsylvania with. But I ask him to let us alone.

Mr. Chairman, if these gentlemen's minds were not as inaccessible to reason as their hearts seem devoid of kindness towards a portion of their countrymen, I would gladly ask them to listen to some few facts. When I was a young man and first observed public events in North Carolina, free negroes voted as white citizens. Free negroes voted in North Carolina until an amendment was made in our State constitution in 1835. And in the town of Newbern, where I lived, according to my recollection, out of three hundred voters, sixty of them were free blacks. And when the proposition was made in our convention, in 1835, to deprive free negroes of the privilege of voting, it was opposed by some of our ablest and best men. I think the vote stood 65 for abolishing the right, and 69 against it; and among these sixty are recorded the names of Judges Gaston and Daniel, then two of the Judges of our Supreme Court; Mr. Rayner, favorably known here, and I think also Mr. Montgomery and Mr. Charles Fisher, afterwards members of Congress from my State, and other gentlemen whose names I cannot now remember. Well, sir, what is the effect of the agitation of Abolitionists? Have you improved the condition of the free negroes? Far from it. And if the same proposition were submitted to a State Convention in North Carolina, at this day, not one man would vote for it. Within my own memory, emancipation of a slave was a matter of frequent occurrence. A simple petition to the court, on half a sheet of paper, at the request of the master, alleging his slave had rendered meritorious services, and the slave was made free. But these fanatics circulated papers containing doctrines like those avowed in the speeches I have referred to, and the inevitable consequence was, that legislation interfered, for insurrection was talked of in the infamous papers of the Abolitionists, and a feeling that it was necessary to protect our firesides and our homes compelled us to be careful. And how is it now? Emancipation is a difficult matter. In extraordinary cases, our legislature sometimes emancipates. Our laws allow slaves to be emancipated by will, but not to remain in the State. As the public mind became excited, our people thought it wrong to allow emancipation when free negroes could visit our northern States, and return with mischievous intentions; and legislation threw difficulties in the way of emancipation.

This has been the effect of men holding the opinions of the gentlemen from Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, (Mann and Stevens,) and publishing them as they have. Emancipation was going on daily; but not so now. Northern gentlemen who can understand how the whole of their section can be excited by passing a resolution declaring you shall not petition for any thing and every thing, can also understand how denunciation, threats and impudent interference with our rights, can excite our people to a feeling of resistance. That feeling has caused them to oppose emancipation. Sir, I remember well when we had negro meeting houses, and negro preachers, some of whom could read and write well; but you philanthropists—these men who would rather look on rivers of blood than that slavery should be extended one inch, and have such horror of chains, shackles and despotism—they sent incendiary documents among our slaves, exciting them to insurrection. As an inevitable result, education was forbidden. Self protection required it—protection for the slaves required it. And this is another fruit of your sympathy for the slave! But we do not deny their religious instruction. In one town in my district, the negroes have a clergyman of their own, and church—a Methodist church. I wish northern gentlemen could see them, neatly dressed, with cheerful faces, as they are going to